

REMARKS

In the above-identified application the claims have again been rejected as being anticipated in view of the cited Ohmori patent. Although it is believed that Applicant's claims were patentably distinct over that reference, each of the independent claims has been amended herein to stress those distinctions. Also, certain ones of the dependent claims have been amended to conform to the changes made to the independent claims.

In particular, the independent claims have been amended to refer to the template *“having a plurality of attributes including cutting rules comprising at least a plurality of predetermined edited segment durations”*. This amendment, supported by the Specification as seen, for example, in “Example 1-Standard Template” at page 17 line 9 and following, describes a particular template having predetermined edited segment durations of 10 seconds and 4 seconds.

On page 4 of the Office Action, it is stated that Applicant's claimed “template including at least a plurality of predetermined edited segment durations” can be read upon Fig. 5 of the cited Ohmori patent and the registered clips displayed at the clip information part 32 on the main screen 30 as discussed at column 11 lines 27-31 thereof. Furthermore, the Office Action states that Applicant's claimed “editing instruction data configured to form output edited segments from the at least one clip” can be read upon Ohmori at Fig. 5, and column 11 line 32 to column 12 line 5, which Applicant notes also includes the disclosure of Fig. 6.

In response, however, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited portions of Ohmori have been carefully considered and are not believed to disclose the specifically claimed limitations of the presently amended claims.

In particular, attention is drawn to the Ohmori patent at column 11 lines 40-43

where it is stated:

“As a result, in this first or second video track 35C or 35E, the CPU 20 displays frames 60A and 60D of the length corresponding to the material length of the clip specified in the manner mentioned above with the position of the cursor at that time set to their heads as shown in Fig. 6.”

Most significant in this quoted portion is the reference to the “material length of the clip”.

Ohmori first refers to “material length” at column 1 line 38 where he refers to the “material length of the selected clip”. that is, “selected clip” is the original raw footage obtained from a time of commencement of a recording to a time of cessation of recording. This is equivalent to the “clip duration” which may be determined from metadata corresponding to the time at which recording was commenced and the time at which recording was ceased. Ohmori then refers to “material length” at column 3 line 14 and 23 where various marks are made for edited content based upon the material length. It is apparent from this disclosure that the material length in Ohmori is used to create or identify edited content, and that the “material length” does not relate to actual edited content itself. This interpretation is further supported by the reference to “material length” at column 6 line 22 of Ohmori. Similar references are made at column 10 line 35, column 10 line 54 and column 10 line 58.

The specific reference mentioned in the Office Action at page 4 of “material length” occurs at column 11 line 41 and is consistent with the previous use of interpretation of material length. Furthermore, and as seen in Fig. 5 of Ohmori, the “registered clips” displayed in the clip information part 32 relate to the original (raw) clip footage that has been obtained and that is intended to be manually edited by the user of Ohmori’s system.

The Office Action then states that the claimed “edit instruction data” can be read on the selected frames and the clip portions shown in Fig. 6 which, according to the description of Ohmori, have been manually edited or selected by the user from the clip information part 32. However, the arrangement described in Ohmori, as previously submitted, is quite different from that disclosed and claimed in the present application. As recited in the presently amended claims, the present invention utilizes a template which includes cutting rules, and the cutting rules having predetermined edited segment durations. The template and the associated cutting rules are applied to the input clip or clips to produce an edited output sequence in which the edited output segments have edited segment durations corresponding to the durations specified in the cutting rules of the template. In the Office Action, the registered clips 32 have been equated with the “template of the present application”. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that the registered clips 32 of Ohmori, at best, could only be equated to the raw footage, such shown in Fig. 2 of the present application. The template in the present invention stands in isolation to the raw footage but is nevertheless applied to the raw footage to obtain the edited output sequence including the output edited segments. More specifically, in the present invention, it is the output edited segments that have durations as specified in the cutting rules of the template and which arise from the second processing step of the claim.

Ohmori, as previously submitted, is entirely silent as to a template of predetermined cutting rules which include predetermined edited segment durations. Ohmori further is silent as to an edited output sequence in which the various edited segments contained in the sequence have durations limited to the specified edited segment durations specified by the cutting rules of the template. Moreover, Ohmori does not produce edit instruction data from an

application of a template to raw footage , and does not disclose using such edit instruction data to control an automated editing of the raw footage.

Accordingly, the above-requested amendments to each of the independent claims clearly provide patentable distinctions over the disclosure of the Ohmori patent. In view of the dependency of the other claims, each of those claims is also considered to be patentable.

For all of these various reasons it is believed that the application is in condition for the issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/John A. Krause/
John A. Krause
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 24,613

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 601955v1